

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/801,111	03/15/2004	Yoshihiro Kobayashi	9319S-000705	9276	
27572 75	90 07/29/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			CHANG,	CHANG, JOSEPH	
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2817		
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Ammii anti am Nia	Amplicant/a)				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	10/801,111	KOBAYASHI, YOSHIHIRO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joseph Chang	2817				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. & 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> , ,					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ This	action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•	·				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.		•				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 March 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		•				
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents		No				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority						
application from the International Bureau	·	ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	2 2232 33 1100 1000110					
	•					
Attachment(s)						
1) 🔯 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) 🔲 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary					
3) Anformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/15/04</u> .	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/801,111

Art Unit: 2817

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "in the gain adjusting step" . There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "each of the gain and phase calculation step".

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogiso US Pub. No. 20040140875.

Regarding Claim 1, Ogiso discloses an oscillator circuit (Figure 1) comprising: a plurality of amplifiers(21,22,23), which also function as impedance buffers (intrinsically); a feedback circuit (SAW, 5a), an input side of the feedback circuit being connected to an output terminal of the amplifier (Q2 of 23) an output side of the feedback circuit (D1 and D2 of 5a) being connected to an input terminal of the amplifier (21) a second phase-shift circuit (5a) provided in the feedback circuit, a piezoelectric vibrator (SAW) provided in the feedback circuit, wherein the second phase-shift circuit (5a) and the piezoelectric vibrator (SAW) are connected in series with each other.

However, Ogiso does not discloses a first phase-shift circuit connected between the amplifiers, the first phase-shift circuit being capable of adjusting the phase of an oscillator loop nor the second phase-shift circuit (5a) being capable of adjusting the phase and gain of the oscillator loop.

As would have been well known in the art, an adjustable phase shift circuit would have provided an adjustment for the phase for any oscillation circuit.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a phase adjustment circuit to the oscillator of Ogiso because such a modification would have provided the benefit of adjustment of phase so that the oscillation can be properly generated.

Regarding Claim 2, Figure 1 shows a tank circuit (5a) that inherently resonates at an oscillation frequency of SAW.

Regarding claim 3, 7, having an extra adjustment of VCO would have been obvious based on fine adjustment of oscillation.

Regarding claim 4, 8, 11, 16 Figures 1 shows the amplifiers are differential.

Regarding claim 5, 9, 12, an emitter-coupled logic circuit in the differential amplifier is a typical configuration, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that.

Regarding claim 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, Figure 1 shows three SAW resonators.

Regarding claims 20-23, the method limitations in the apparatus claim are considered process steps because they are directed to how the device is made and not a structural limitation. it should be noted that a "product-by-process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how such a product was made. It has been well established by the Courts that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product-by-process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product-by-process" form or not. See In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3); In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessman, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289; and in particular In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964. It should be noted that the applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. It is noted that claims 20-13 are apparatus claims because they are dependent from the apparatus claim 1

Regarding claim 24, a mass measuring apparatus would have been an intended use and, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 2817

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Satoh et al. shows phase shift SAW oscillation circuit.

Yarranton et al. discloses a SAW with phase shift oscillation circuit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Chang whose telephone number is 571 272-1759. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 0700-1730.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (571) 272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph Chang Patent Examiner Art Unit 2817 Page 5